

PUBLIC INTEREST SCOPING SESSION

WESTCOAST INTERNATIONAL INN

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

JUNE 27, 2001

SPONSORED BY

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda	2
Assistant Director Larsen's Welcoming Comments	4
Director Regelin's Opening Comments	4
Assistant Director Larsen's Opening Comments	7
Topics, with Issues, Discussion Points, and Possible Solutions	
Game management & research	8
Subsistence	12
Planning	14
Tourism	16
Nongame management & research / watchable wildlife	17
Habitat	19
Education	21
Public Service	23
Suggested Ways to Effectively Communicate with the Public	24
Director Regelin's Comments on Funding	25
Suggested Ways to Spend New Money	27
Director Regelin's Closing Comments	28
Assistant Director Larsen's Closing Comments	29
Session Evaluation	29
List of Participants	30

AGENDA

Times: Starting: 8:30 a.m. Ending: 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Purpose: This meeting is about the future of wildlife management in Alaska. This scoping session is being held to obtain insights and ideas about issues and concerns associated with wildlife uses and management in Alaska. The purpose of this session is fact-finding, rather than decision-making, and offers an opportunity to provide ideas through a cooperative process.

Specific Meeting Objectives:

- (1) To gather strategic planning input on the issues and concerns of important Division of Wildlife Conservation (DWC) stakeholders regarding education, public service, nongame management and research, watchable wildlife, and game management and research.
- (2) To learn about issues and concerns related to other areas of public and stakeholder interest.
- (3) To gain insights into how issues and concerns can be dealt with : What are some of the solutions stakeholders believe might be useful in dealing with important issues?
- (4) How can DWC do the best possible job of communicating with stakeholders?
- (5) If additional funds become available for wildlife conservation in Alaska, what should these additional funds be used for?

Meeting Chair: Wayne Regelin, Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation

Facilitators: Spencer Amend and Tommy Shropshire, Dynamic Solutions Group LLC

Workshop Staff: Teri Arnold, Mark Burch, Doug Larsen, Margo Matthews

Time (length)	Topic	Responsible Person	Product/Outcome
7:45 (45)	Continental breakfast	Participants	Meet new contacts
8:30 (5)	Welcome	Doug Larsen	Meeting begun
8:35 10)	Introductions	Participants	We all know who is here
8:45 (5)	Agenda review	Spencer Amend	We all know what is planned
8:50 (15)	Why are we here?	Wayne Regelin	We understand the context
9:10 (10)	What are we doing? The DWC planning process	Doug Larsen	We see how it all fits together
9:20 (20)	What is on your minds? Issue identification and posting	Tommy Shropshire/All	Participants identify and post important issues and concerns
9:40 (20)	Break		
10:00 (15)	What is most important to Alaskan wildlife? Identify priority areas of interest/ concern	Spencer/All	Participants identify which issue areas hold greatest importance for Alaskan wildlife

Time (length)	Topic	Responsible Person	Product/Outcome
10:15 (75)	What would you do? Concurrent working sessions to clarify issues and develop solutions	Facilitators and work groups	Participants refine the issues and propose solutions
11:30 (30)	What did we learn? Work group reports	Reporters: one from each work group	We all learn what the other work groups have accomplished
Noon	Lunch	provided by DWC in or near the meeting room	A welcomed break!
12:45 (75)	What is most important to Alaskan wildlife? What would you do? Second round of concurrent working sessions to clarify issues and develop sessions to a new set of issue categories	Facilitators and work groups	Participants attack a second group of issue areas, refining these and proposing solutions
2:00 (30)	What did we learn? Work group reports	Reporters: one from each work group	We all learn what these work groups have accomplished
2:30 (30)	Communicating with the public and stakeholder groups	Tommy/all	Participants help DWC understand how best to communicate with constituents
3:00 (15)	Possibilities of new funding	Wayne Regelin	Participants understand possibilities for new DWC funding
3:15 (30)	Identifying high leverage opportunities for any new money	Spencer/All	Participants give DWC help deciding where possible new funding would help Alaskan wildlife most
3:45 (15)	Final questions and answers	Participants/Regelin and/or Larsen	Participants have the final word
4:00 (15)	Meeting summary and wrap-up	Wayne Regelin and/or Doug Larsen	Feedback on what DWC has heard today and what they intend to do about it
4:15 (15)	Meeting evaluation	Mark Burch/All	Participants help DWC and workshop staff learn how to have better sessions
4:30	Adjourn		

WELCOMING COMMENTS FROM DOUG LARSEN

Assistant Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation

Good morning and welcome to today's scoping session. I would like to thank you all for your interest in and concern for Alaska's wildlife, and for your willingness to assist with identifying issues and possible solutions associated with wildlife management and conservation. We recognize that you are taking time out of your busy schedules to attend today's session and we are very appreciative of your commitment and involvement.

My name is Doug Larsen and I have been the Assistant Director for the Division of Wildlife Conservation since 1998. My primary responsibilities are to lead and coordinate the division's strategic planning effort and assist with the division's organizational development and operations.

The purposes of today's session are to, (1) consider and discuss the future of wildlife management in Alaska, and (2) obtain insights and ideas about issues and concerns associated with wildlife uses and management. This is a fact-finding rather than a decision-making session. It is not designed to debate the pros or cons of ideas or interests. The group purposefully includes a broad mix of backgrounds and interests.

I look forward to working with all of you today and to learning what issues, concerns, and possible solutions you have. At this point I will turn the session over to Spencer Amend and Tommy Shropshire, our two lead facilitators who are with *Dynamic Solutions Group*, and are serving as consultants for our planning process.

OPENING COMMENTS FROM WAYNE REGELIN

Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation

Thank you for coming today and showing your interest in and concern for wildlife conservation in Alaska. I know you are all busy and I really appreciate you taking time to help us plan for the future of wildlife management in Alaska.

When I accepted the position of Director of the Division of Wildlife Conservation 6 ½ years ago, I made a commitment to myself, division staff and my boss to prepare the Division to meet the challenges of the future. I felt that changes in the division were needed, not because we were not good at what we were doing, but because we needed to broaden the mission of the division and become a full service wildlife management agency. I committed the Division to a strategic planning process, not to writing a plan that would set on a shelf and not be used, but to a process to make us think ahead and prepare for our future.

My long-term goals were to improve our public service program and to expand division programs or build new programs in the areas of wildlife education, management of species that are not hunted or trapped and watchable wildlife. I wanted to do all of these new things while also improving our programs to manage hunting and trapping and maintaining our strong biological information base.

To accomplish these goals, I saw us needing 3 things. First, and most important, was a source of funding for major programs in wildlife education and management of species not hunted. Our funding level was not large enough for us to effectively move into these areas without damaging other programs. We needed a significant increase in new funds.

Also, I did not think it was fair to hunters nor politically wise to use only hunting and trapping license fees and federal aid funds derived from the excise tax on guns and ammunition for programs that benefit all Alaskans and all visitors to Alaska. So, we needed to find a new funding source for the Division.

Second, we needed to improve the internal workings of the Division. I felt we needed changes in management structure and style as we moved into the 21st century.

Third, we needed to reach out to the public and ask them how they want their wildlife to be managed, what programs they want the Division to provide, and how they want to be involved and participate with the Division. This meeting is the first formal step in our efforts to reach out to the public in the area of strategic planning, but I assure you it will not be the last.

Let me back up for a minute and tell you about some of the internal changes that have taken place in the Division. We made a commitment to a team approach to management and to delegation of decision-making. I think this approach shows that employees are trusted and leads to more innovative and responsible actions by all.

I established a division management team of senior level staff to share decision making with me. We established a PEER group, a cross section of division staff to advise the division management team on a wide array of issues that affect the staff and the division's functions.

I wanted to be proactive on issues and to address them before they became a crisis. This led to creation of a new planning section within the Division. This group of professional planners works on local and regional management plans such as the Kodiak Brown Bear Plan and the Koyukuk Moose Management Plan as well as our statewide strategic planning efforts.

And we have improved internal communications within the Division using a variety of methods. I think we now have more effective communication within the division. All employees have several ways to move their ideas upward.

I think we have made significant progress in changing some of our basic ways of doing business internally and these changes have set the stage to allow us to broaden our mission without internal conflict.

The most critical need was to find a new funding source so we could accomplish our broader mission. Along with many others in the division, I worked very hard on the Teaming With Wildlife concept to provide new funding for all state wildlife agencies in the nation. This effort evolved over 5 years into the CARA legislation. We have had some success in getting new legislation passed, but we did not get everything we had hoped for.

I will share some insights on new funding sources later today.

I was reluctant to move forward with asking the public to provide advice until I had more definite knowledge about increased funding. However, I would have moved forward with this effort at some point regardless of the availability of new funds. We already spend over \$20 million dollars per year in the division and we can do a better job deciding how to spend these funds, but it's nice to be able to suggest new programs knowing that some can be implemented without reducing ongoing programs. At the same time, though, I would like your insights on our ongoing programs and whether you think they should be revised, ended, or enhanced.

In January the Division established 5 internal work groups to begin planning for our future. We have 8 to 10 person work teams made up entirely of division staff thinking about the future and making suggestions for improving current programs and building new ones. We have work groups for wildlife education, watchable wildlife, public service, management of non-game species and enhancement of management and research. These are 5 of the issue categories we would like to get your input on today.

During the next year we will be working with the public to get suggestions in each of these broad areas and perhaps others areas that you suggest today. We are not entirely sure what specific processes we will use to obtain public input, but one product we hope will come from this meeting is suggestions for how we should gather meaningful input about issues and programs. Possible methods include public meetings, meetings with selected groups, focus groups, and public surveys.

The Division Management Team will take all of the recommendations from the internal working groups and the public and synthesize them into a variety of programs and projects that will set the course for the Division's long-term future.

I get excited thinking about our future. We have an opportunity to broaden the division so it can become a full-service wildlife management agency. We have the opportunity to provide a wide array of wildlife related recreational opportunities throughout Alaska. We have the opportunity to develop an outstanding fish and wildlife education program in our schools and complementary education programs in our communities. We have always had the responsibility and now the opportunity to expand our biological base to include all wildlife species in Alaska, not just those that are hunted or trapped.

I think the Division of Wildlife Conservation is the right agency to lead this effort and the people in this room are some of the people that we need to listen to as we plan our future. We need your help to make it a reality.

I expect to get a lot of advice during the next few hours. That's why you were invited. I promise that we will listen.

OPENING COMMENTS FROM DOUG LARSEN

As Wayne said earlier, in 1995 the Division of Wildlife Conservation began to implement some internal changes that included creating a Division Management Team (DMT) and a PEER Group. Creation of these entities has helped the division move away from an autocratic decision-making system to more of a participatory system. It has provided staff with opportunities to be involved in developing the division's visions, mission, guiding philosophy, and goals, which were drafted a little over a year ago. They include the following:

VISION: Excellence in Wildlife Conservation & Public Service

MISSION: Conserve and enhance Alaska's wildlife and habitats and provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits

GUIDING PHILOSOPHY and VALUES:

The Division of Wildlife Conservation recognizes wildlife as a public trust belonging to all Alaskans. We respect the diversity of public values associated with wildlife and support uses that reflect public support and sound principles of conservation. We are an organization of individuals committed to interacting professionally with one another and the public and to using scientific data and public input to conserve Alaska's wildlife.

GOALS:

- (1) Extend and improve services, opportunities, and outreach to all wildlife users.**
- (2) Maintain and enhance our high level of wildlife research and management expertise.**
- (3) Improve our internal effectiveness and efficiency.**
- (4) Promote public participation in decision-making.**
- (5) Develop methods to deal with dual management of our wildlife resources and work for resumption of state management.**

Early on, the division recognized the value and importance of involving both staff and the public in the identification and development of meaningful programs and activities for effectively managing and conserving Alaska's wildlife.

As Wayne noted earlier, the PEER Group and DMT jointly identified 5 areas for which input was desired: (1) Education, (2) Public Service, (3) Watchable Wildlife, (4) Nongame Management and Research, and (5) Game Management and Research. We anticipate most issues or concerns fitting within one or more of these 5 areas, but are prepared to create additional areas if they seem warranted based on the input that's received.

To date, 5 work groups of 8-10 staff have been created to identify issues and recommend solutions within the 5 areas. We will be placing summaries of work issues and recommendations on our web site for public review and comment.

While the division has long recognized the value and importance of public involvement, there has been some uncertainty with when and how this should occur. Our idea was originally to develop strawman ideas through our work groups that could be taken to the public and serve to

stimulate discussion and feedback. However, we've since recognized that to be most effective, we need the benefit of public input up front and not just after the fact. It is for this reason that we are holding this scoping session today.

This session represents our initial effort to formally gather insights and views from a cross-section of groups with diverse interests and experiences related to wildlife management and uses. Issues, concerns, and possible solutions that you provide today will be given to our work groups for inclusion in their efforts. In addition, your input and recommendations will be forwarded to our DMT for consideration and possible implementation. Furthermore, we recognize that as useful and important as today's session is, there's a need for additional public input opportunities. We will therefore be developing additional involvement opportunities using a variety of processes, including focus groups, public opinion surveys, open houses, public meetings, web interactions, and any others you identify for us to consider. These will occur throughout the coming fall and winter.

Staff and public input and recommendations will be seriously considered by the DMT as the division seeks to develop an effective strategic plan for managing and conserving Alaska's wildlife into the future. While we can't guarantee that every idea or recommendation will be fully implemented, we can guarantee that we will do all we can within our social, political, and biological sideboards to act and respond responsibly.

I need to offer a clear distinction between our strategic planning efforts and CARA funding that is looming on the horizon. Wayne will be talking a little later about future funding for the division that may include new federal money. I must emphasize, however, that our strategic planning effort is the over-arching process under which additional resource and opportunities lie. Funds, new or existing, that come to the division will be used to best address issues and concerns that are identified by staff and the public, recognizing that new funding offers opportunities to develop or enhance programs that we might otherwise not be able to pursue.

Today's session is designed to identify and gather issues, concerns, and recommended solutions. It is not designed for debating issues or proposed solutions.

We expect to have a draft strategic plan developed by next June that incorporates staff and public input, and that will be open to revision and modification as a result of additional input. Strategic planning provides guidance, but to be truly effective, must be dynamic and open to revision or modification based on new input or changing conditions. In this context, the plan becomes a "living" document. Today's session is a beginning to what we are designing to be an ongoing process. Again, thanks for being here and assisting with this effort.

TOPICS, ISSUES, DISCUSSION POINTS, AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Game Management and Research

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Incorporate elder and traditional knowledge into programs and management schemes.

- Rural preference over sport use; how to balance.
- Maintain an adequate supply to provide first for subsistence and then for commercial and sport hunting and trapping.
- Long and short term effects of regulation and management on cultural systems and subsistence in rural Alaska.
- Single species based management is a problem.
- Since 1959, when Alaska took control of wildlife management, our robust wildlife population has declined. Why has it?
- Managing for abundance within the “sustainable yield principal.”
- Commercial versus recreational versus subsistence.
- How to increase man-days in the field with more demand for the resource.
- Integrating traditional ecological knowledge into wildlife management: How can the knowledge of elders in the villages be fully integrated into wildlife management? How can state regulatory processes widen their focus so the broader perspectives of the elders will be taken seriously in the process, and can play a guiding role.
- Stronger cooperation versus advisory participation.
- Wanton waste of game needs careful attention and funding for enforcement.
- Future wildlife management needs to provide for co-management opportunities.
- Use, access, application of traditional knowledge and wisdom in research and management.
- Future wildlife management needs to protect critical habitat areas and wildlife populations from over harvest and predation.
- More co-management agreements with the tribes to develop a credible working capacity.
- How best to share resources across the state with different organizations.
- Apparent lack of willingness by ADFG to support traditional uses by asserting their legitimacy.
- Current process is in jeopardy.
- Let us let wildlife run wild! Don’t over manage.
- Not balanced board of game. Get a balanced board of game.
- Create a board of wildlife whose membership truly represents the diversity of major wildlife values.
- Wildlife enforcement needs to develop a tribal court system in the villages.
- State of Alaska seems to spend \$\$ after \$\$ on studies. When will the results of predator study be published and acted upon?
- Place much less emphasis on intensive game management.
- Establish wildlife management areas near urban areas ahead of development.
- Projects in unit 11 and unit 13 regarding habitat projects
- Provide hunting opportunities for residents and visitors
- Cooperative initiatives with other landowners and managers of critical habitats – to sustain populations over time (native corporations, boroughs, feds).
- Private landowners should be considered as partners in Alaska’s wildlife future.
- Wildlife management needs to include local agencies and organizations.
- Planning and regulatory processes need to include meaningful participation of locals.
- Paperwork and reporting requirements will be simple, unencumbered for small locally owned businesses

- AK wildlife = economy, recreation, subsistence, prosperity, enhancement, harvest, managed resource, protected resource.
- Increasing propensity of ADFG and certain segments of the public to oppose actual, effective management programs.
- Need more resources (\$\$) for development of moose management plans.
- More funding for harvest assessments with agreements of local organizations.
- Management will be done by emotion without science.
- Full co-management with tribal governments: How can the state implement its Millennium Agreement with the Tribes to ensure that tribal governments in the villages will be full and equal governmental partners in wildlife management? Local village governments know local wildlife resources and needs best, and have a critical role to play in protecting resources.
- Stop sport hunting in any area where the local population can't find the animals for their food.
- Management solutions that protect resources well before they are jeopardized.
- Maintain healthy natural (not grossly manipulated) populations of all wildlife species.
- Keep population numbers high and healthy.
- Maintain for enough to provide for subsistence needs of rural Alaskans.
- Maintaining balance of consumptive and non-consumptive uses of wildlife.
- Balancing uses; preserving rural subsistence uses at adequate levels.
- Maintain or provide for diversity protection of species.
- Maintain or provide for diversity protection of species so one population doesn't extinguish another.
- Provide for protection of the health of all edible species.
- Maintain healthy populations of all wildlife species by sound biological management decisions.
- To fund and provide the wildlife research that is needed for scientifically sound decision-making.
- Study food chain.
- Provisions for enhancing/maintaining public access to pursue wildlife/recreation.
- More research, more research, more research.
- Broaden the diversity of research to place more emphasis on understanding the importance of habitat and climate.
- Research, determine, plus address important threats to habitat and wildlife: ATV's, snow machines, development/sprawl, roads, exotic insects.
- Science based wildlife management.
- Research and management dealing with interspecies and habitat relationships.
- Clearinghouse for any and all research.
- How to control predators.
- Predator control: need to develop plan and set the government to follow through on the plan.
- Understand and maintain predator/prey balance in state.

Discussion points:

- Predators.
- Diversity of populations (all wildlife).

- Unhealthy effects.
- Research.
- Management decision-making.
- Habitat.
- Resource use – subsistence.
- Enforcement/waste.

Predators – control

- Is it practical?
- Access to animals is difficult.
- Complex systems.
- Bears/wolves – move problems; maybe kill.
- Public information and science based.
- Maybe manage by area – not whole state.
- Imbalance of populations.
- Low pelt price.
- Political issue; board of game; animal rights.
- Past studies spent money on same issues; what about habitat effect.
- Public must support.

Decision Making

- Role of board of game and composition of board – balance (sport, guide, tourism, knowledgeable people, subsistence, non-consumptive users).
- Who else should be involved; role of tribes relative to state/fed; local knowledge.
- Co-management definition.
- Increased role of advisory committee.
- Has been reduced funding for advisory committee.

Possible Solutions:

- Open process – improve tribes/committee involvement; elders; broaden focus, local.
- Involve various interests, including those with less money.
- Operate by consensus.
- Sound science info base for decisions – include traditional knowledge.
- Sound science information base for decisions; include traditional knowledge.
- More co-management with tribes; partnerships with state and feds.
- State and federal agencies should cooperate with programs and data.
- Less focus on “who is boss”, shared, process, open.
- Funding for process.
- ADFG provide public with more information; should come forward; news releases, public meetings, etc. don’t stand back and let board do it all.
- Make this an action item; heard this all before.
- Put money in local area to help with habitat and on the ground management; data collection - harvest policing.
- Have local involvement in decisions.

- Language: stereotypical name calling hurts the process; need mutual respect.
- Need empathy for the other guy.
- Educational forum for people to get together and understand views of others (like this meeting).
- Need to agree that there is a problem.
- Look at other solutions.
- Subsistence priority for rural Alaska.
- Address predator control – the problem.

Subsistence

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Will we apply and enforce the Alaska Constitution? Will we abide by the U.S. Constitution? Will equal protection – non-discrimination parts of U.S. history be implemented?
- Who is the proper sovereign? Will the federal, state or some other government have authority? Will this be divided?
- Provide resources needed to support subsistence in rural Alaska.
- Develop co-management with tribes.
- Need to develop co-management with tribes and others.
- Co-management with tribes, non-profits regarding fish and wildlife management.
- Need more co-management programs/projects with the local villages or regional corporation.
- Divided management authority is disintegrating Alaska culture. How can we reconcile without good purpose or cause? Further division is harming society and conservation efforts.
- Resolution of subsistence dilemma.
- Need for cross-cultural communications and awareness orientation on more than an ad hoc basis.
- Subsistence allocations and urban/commercial demand.
- To conserve and be used by those most needing it.
- In time of shortage, let those that depend on wildlife be allowed to use it.

Discussion Points:

Co-management

What opportunities are available?

- Fisheries management - harvest data collection, in-season run assessments.
- A crisis provides opportunity (e.g., Western Alaska fisheries collapse).
- Better to co-manage before a crisis occurs.
- Big game management – harvest data collection.
- What about non-Native people in co-management?
- Co-management is not a Native-only thing – it includes other rural residents, landowners and tribes.
- Fish and Game is a common public trust property – it doesn't belong to the landowner it occurs on.

Who are we co-managing with?

- Land owners.
- Alaskan citizens.
- Local residents in the vicinity of the resources.
- Tribes.
- Regional and village corporations.
- Non-profits.

What is co-management?

- There are many levels of co-management, from minimal review and consultation to true co-management.
- Involving those who live near and depend on and have the knowledge of the resources.
- Local Advisory Committee system is a good example.
- Management involves regulations, research and enforcement.
- Where is the management authority? State and federal government and the Board of Fishery and Game.
- Example of co-management agreement: Bristol Bay Native Association is monitoring subsistence harvest on the Togiak River for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- We are practicing co-management already, mainly with the feds. Now we just need to refine it.
- We don't want to "take over the world" – we just want to be involved in the decision making.

Resolution of the subsistence dilemma/divided management

- Education is needed to help people understand what subsistence is.
- Put it to a vote of the people of Alaska.
- It needs to be resolved – it is tearing Alaska apart.
- Resolution is tied to giving rural residents a slight advantage. For example, an early start to a hunting season.
- Resolution should be on an "in times of shortage" basis only, which wouldn't happen if management was done for maximum sustained yield so that game populations wouldn't diminish.
- Need to address other methods of take, such as rim-fire cartridges and other methods. The hunting regulations often don't accommodate these methods.
- Should there be other criteria besides rural? Such as longevity in Alaska, regardless of where you live?
- Is subsistence the equivalent of a federal treaty obligation?
- Basic human rights shouldn't be decided by voting.
- Consider proximity to other sources of food, like Safeway, McDonalds, to determine need.
- The basis of need should include all factors – not just where you live. Basing it only on where you live is discrimination.
- The subsistence lifestyle is not changing – it's happening in the villages as it has for thousands of years, regardless of the laws and regulations.
- There are cultural rights involved too, as well as human rights.

- Cultural rights vs. human rights – they are different levels. Human rights transcend all cultures.
- The increase in human population is part of the problem.
- Subsistence hunting is more than just the act of hunting – it is part of a whole lifestyle and culture.
- Managers can't understand subsistence culture if they don't hear and feel it inside.
- Concern that urban residents won't be able to hunt in the future just because they live in a city. Hunting is part of their culture too. Anchorage is the largest Native village.
- Subsistence uses (not users) should be the priority use over other uses, so in time of shortage commercial and sport uses should be cut first – it cannot be based on discrimination.

Possible Solutions:

The group did not develop potential solutions or recommendations on the subsistence issue.

Planning

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Manage better from input
- Need to sponsors forum between sport hunters and AK natives and between agency

Personnel and Alaska Natives:

- Use of conflict mediation and resolution processes.
- Identify how other state agencies affect wildlife (i.e. mining).
- Broaden WL manage to rep. societal needs instead of stakeholders.
- How will public trust of common property be balanced with federal Indian trust? What common property is exempt from racialism?
- Be a strong advocate for WL with in state Gov. and in the planning for any development.
- Local control and planning, planning on a regional basis.
- Develop ecosystem-based management. Kill the current division structure.
- Meet all demand at minimum impact to resources.
- Expand opportunities.
- With anti-access attitudes on public lands, who will defend public access and use of native resources?
- Public access and use of public lands need and organized defense.
- Increase interest and access.
- Gaining access to national park lands to share burden put on state lands to satisfy diverse and sometimes contradictory uses.
- Positive experiences all uses.
- To emphasize what conservationists have in common, rather than the differences.
- To further develop strong conservation ethic with AK residents and visitors.
- Viewing and hunting opportunities will be developed and managed to provide a sustainable source of income for communities.
- Optimum management across all uses.
- Long term availability – all species at optimum yield.

- How does our policy effect the economy?
- Who wins and who loses from decision?
- Can economic values be protected along with environmental values?

Facilitated session:

What is “planning?”

- Public process.
- Management principles.
- Public use/access.
- Economic and funding.
- Legal? Authority? Rights?

What does “planning” mean?

- A inclusive process that is proactive in accomplishing our vision/mission and objectives, to give a framework for making decisions.
- What should a planning process include?
- Values.
- Visions – ideal future.
- Priorities
- Objectives, goals.
- Support for decision making.
- Reflects who we are.
- Reflects partnerships of a diverse community.
 - Large private land owners
 - State
 - Federal
- Cooperative compatible management.
- Gathering information and asking the right questions.
- Legal rights of stakeholders.

Possible Solutions:

- Using the constitution (use the thoughts/words but do not use the word “constitution”), develop a list of out principles to guide our management efforts.
- Identify stakeholders (there is no one authority).
- ID the tools/processes to bring all stakeholder together to work together as a unified vision. Develop partnerships.
- Must have common goals.
- Must ID what each partners gets out of it.
- Must be voluntary.
- ID the right questions.
- ID the right information needed.
- Status of the state, wildlife, habitat.
- Planning muse be sharing (inter-relationships).
- Department planner should propose new tools, processed, information management.

- Planning must/will evoke education.
- Must utilize all sources of information effectively.
- D status of world outside Alaska (impacts on AK).
- National and international partnerships.

Final comment:

“I’m glad I’m not a planner.”

TOURISM

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Guiding and tourism assurance.
- Resident (recreation) and visitor (tourism) needs recognized.
- Adverse impact of large scale “volume” tourism.
- Wildlife viewing opportunities with group sized for economic operations.

Discussion points:

- Government is restricting access of commercial groups big enough for business success or economic viability.
- By restricting access, the cost can become so high that only wealthy can afford it.
- There needs to be a segregation of use capacity areas (tourism zoning).
- There is a lack of wildlife viewing opportunities.
- Lack of knowledge in knowing where to view wildlife and how to find it.
- Lack of accessibility at economically viable prices.
- What material exists to educate is not readily available (i.e., wildlife viewers guide).
- There are great viewing spots in the state that have not been accessed (like Chignik).
- Impacts on habitat and wildlife.
- Private lands – Do land owners want to become partners with the state?
- Conflict with user groups and timing of access to each.
- A need to market wildlife realistically (like no shots of someone two feet from head of bear).
- Marketers should be allowed to run wild!
- There is documented information of tourists who come with false expectations and then experience disappointment.
- A need to keep wild lands and wildlife wild (keep diversity of opportunity - don’t turn Alaska into an animal theme park).
- Need more high volume viewing opportunities like Denali, done well – there’s plenty of space.
- State should work with federal agencies for viewing opportunities on federal lands. Cooperation is necessary.
- Recognize 2 different groups, resident and nonresident, and individual and overlapping needs.
- Need for community education that hunting guiding and other tourism can exist together.
- Developed viewing of habituated wildlife would displace hunting.

Possible solutions:

- Planning is needed in areas where there is high intensity demand.
 - Overall inventory.
 - Dispersed viewing opportunities.
- Educate agencies about economics.
- Market study – economic research.
- Industry, government, and private land owners come together to come up with wildlife viewing guidelines.
- Tourism industry should have representation on the Board of Game to work with wildlife decision makers.
- Research a “Board of Wildlife” to deal with viewing issues (dual boards – BOG and BOW work together).
- Financial incentives to encourage small business to be involved with tourism (like little grants, tax breaks).
- Department of Fish and Game and Department of Community and Economic Development recommend to State of Alaska (and Feds) to provide financial grants to small business for wildlife tourism opportunities in areas where there is less development in economically depressed areas.
- Don’t do state run grant program. Don’t think they’ll work.

Combination of Non-Game Management & Research with Watchable Wildlife**Issues:** (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Wildlife marketing guidelines.
- Provisions for enhancing/maintaining public access to pursue wildlife/recreational activities.
- Sustained yield principle promotes watchable populations of animals.
- Wildlife that meets all resident and visitor needs viewing – hunting, etc.
- Quality of outdoor experience on state lands reduced. User conflicts: hunting versus non-hunting. Some think you can not mix them, some you can.
- Establish accessible network of quality wildlife viewing areas and opportunities for variety of key species.
- Provide viewing opportunities for residents and visitors to Alaska.
- Viewing and hunting opportunities will be provided for in accordance with local community development objectives.
- Create major areas for watchable wildlife activities to occur unencumbered by hunting and trapping.
- Increased opportunities for watchable wildlife/viewing (facilities and management of game for viewing as well as other purposes).
- Have enough wildlife for all.
- Access to wildlife viewing.
- Quality wildlife viewing destinations/places.
- More viewing opportunities.
- Increased participation between ADFG and others on the watchable wildlife conservation trust advisory committee (\$ + active interest).

- Increased cooperation between non-profit and government agencies (i.e.: programs that benefit watchable wildlife).
- The future of wildlife management in AK includes increased funding for non-profit/government agencies watchable wildlife projects (through ACF/ADFG watchable wildlife conservation trust).
- Broader public involvement in wildlife-related management decisions.
- Understanding and managing for natural habitats.
- ADFG regulatory staff must be more open to local knowledge of habitats and wildlife populations – incorporate local knowledge in permit and planning decisions.
- ADFG needs to bring funds to efforts to acquire and preserve critical habitats and to restoration projects
- Pressure for the future.
- Maintain healthy populations.
- Keep species off endangered list.
- Care for injured wildlife.
- ADFG should coordinate with other agencies, local governments, and publics to identify critical habitats (for individual species and species groups) and focus on protection of these areas – including acquisition
- To fund studies regarding the economic values of wildlife with emphasis on non-monetary values.
- Balance between rural and urban needs/perspectives.
- Creation of a centralized database and enhanced access to ADFG data by general public (non-game).

Discussion points:

- Wildlife viewing – spectrum from cruise ship (mass) to individual experiences.
- Correlation between numbers of people and quality of experience.
- Range of intensity of experience.
- Quality is in eye of beholder – some check off lists, some want more than that.
- Carrying capacity to maintain quality – doesn't necessarily depend on #'s of people.
- Quality exists commensurate with money people have to spend important to provide experiences for those without lots of money.
- Need for viewing opportunities that are handicapped accessible.
- Quality commensurate with your motivation and ability to get there.
- Quality affected by degree of risk – both positive and negative.

Who is doing the viewing?

- People in RV's.
- Backpackers.

Guided versus non-guided:

- Access for group.
- Size large enough to be economically viable.

Residents versus non-residents

What do we want the future to look like?

- Access for a variety of people.
- High quality of experience (definition differs for each person).
- Manage people to be least intrusive on wildlife.
- Wildlife viewing becomes a conservation strategy (through developing incentives) – builds constituencies. and economic incentives and educates about the importance of conservation.
- watchable wildlife is a tool to establish and maintain a connection with nature.
- Opportunities for all is important (hunters as well as viewers).
- Habitat conservation is essential – and the tie to partnerships and management.

Further details related specifically to Non-Game Management and Research

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

Injured wildlife (secondary priority):

- Permit and support partners.
- Link to education.
- Public demand.
- Treatment can be important for capacity to respond to disasters (like oil spills).

Research:

- Determination of carrying capacity.
- Population research – numbers, threats, habitat, ecosystem.
- Invasive species threats.
- Focus on previously un-researched species.
- Focus on potential future threats that are coming up.
- Basic life history information needed:
- Habitat requirements, and ecological relationships.
- Populations – need information on status, trends and threats. From that, set priorities for life history and vulnerability research.
- Priority should be those species with vulnerability, showing evidence of decline. Be proactive. Get info before species get on endangered species list.
- Develop partnerships with citizen scientists, use volunteers, learn through local knowledge + traditional knowledge.
- Research on economic values.

HABITAT

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Develop more partnerships with other organizations to create better habitat for wildlife. “Everyone working together.”
- Food forage projects in Unit 13 to increase the Nelchina caribou herd.
- Burn in Unit 13 to increase moose population.
- Studies on ORV’s impacts in Unit 13.

- Identify and assess changing patterns of use and impacts (expanding ATV, snowmobile, motorized access).
- Ecological research and habitat enhancement.
- Healthy habitats for wildlife.
- Provide for habitat protection and enhancement.
- Protect the environment so that wildlife will last for generations to come.
- Give a higher priority to habitat management and protection.
- Habitat evaluation and enhancement for big game.
- To sustain wildlife populations and habitat as well as the quality of experience of various user groups.
- Identification of priority areas for conservation.

Discussion points:

- Habitat preservation.
- Urban habitat considerations.
- Habitat conservation versus preservation (use versus no use).
- Over-mature habitat resulting in decreased wildlife populations.
- Fire protection resulting in decreased habitat for wildlife.
- Public attitude towards management.
- Fish and Game needs more management tools; few available, and too few partnerships.
- Political boundaries – not related to habitat – checkerboard.
- Widening of easements and trails – poor maintenance.
- Effects of traffic.

Possible solutions (and numbers of votes received):

- Develop partnerships (DNR, DOT, ADF&G, Federal agencies, and landowners) (6).
- Habitat management should follow sustained yield principle (3).
- Provide the public with a “habitat report” (6).
- Restore habitat destroyed by ORVs (trail on tundra 100’ wide) (1).
- Control easements (2).
- Use new technologies to improve trails to keep people from “going around” (0).
- Educate the public so they know where state, federal, and private land ownership exists, and discourage trespassing (6).
- Redo ORV definition (size) – some are bigger than they should be (0).
- Alternate years of use in some areas to reduce habitat loss. Close snow machining trails if too little snow (0).
- Accept that some places are not recoverable (0).
- DWC should develop habitat models regarding carrying capacity related to wildlife as well as numbers of users (1).
- Look at the life cycle after burn. When can you allow bird watchers back? When will willows come back? Each burn cycle brings new opportunities (0).
- Inform the public on how to use snowmobiles to reduce negative effects, and have them use defined trails (land use ethic) (1).

- Prescribed burn and specific timber harvest techniques to improve habitats and provide this information to land owners (5).
- Work with others (DOT) to build roads (0).
- Don't overdo management – keep it natural (0).
- Look into unintended consequences of management actions. Provide information to the public on ecological interactions (0).
- Implement small demonstration projects (0).
- Control/manage use (i.e., ORVs, numbers of users, easements) (6).

EDUCATION

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Educate those hunters that never hunted before.
- Educate hunters not only about wildlife but minimum impact camping.
- Increase education (hunter Ed in rural AK, IBEP).
- Need for structured educational efforts supporting traditional uses and related management.
- Wildlife viewing guidelines/education.
- Greater development of wildlife conservation education to general public.
- Protect AK's hunting and trapping heritage through public education.
- Hold many more meetings of this type where diversity of viewpoints are given equal weight
- Has the state of AK ever sent surveys to all hunting organizations within state of AK, non-hunting groups – asking for input on wildlife management? This will include various landowners.
- Need for educational effort to communicate to the public historic information necessary to inform decisions related to management regimes and the conflicts arising from such especially between consumptive and non consumptive uses.
- Prevent human/animal conflicts.
- We need broader opportunities for the public to learn about and enjoy wildlife.
- Growing lack of understanding and tolerance for traditional users of wildlife and related management.
- Education project with tribes regarding land ownership.
- Help frame key issues for public discussion needed to protect habitats and populations.
- Educate all Alaskan's of benefits of our wildlife and its management.
- Seek understanding of importance of healthy ecosystems and wildlife well being.
- Education of public regarding the place of wildlife in natural and human environment.
- Public education at all levels (K-adult) on wildlife management.
- Greater education (all wildlife needs and use).
- More emphasis on wildlife related education.
- Create more opportunities for wildlife education.

Two categories:

- Hunter Ed
- Public Ed

Hunter education issues:

- Rural implementation
- Knowledge of what laws are everywhere
- Program unique to communities with differing cultural values
- Foster responsible hunters in field

Hunter education solutions:

- Enough money made available to reach all of Alaska
- A need to work with rural Alaska for acceptance and buy-in to hunter Ed.
- Education of elders and councils
- Have had good acceptance when focus on gun safety
- Understanding of why regulations are there and why are they needed
- Send people out to villages to find out what is needed by villages in hunter education (outside people seem to impose far too many things without first asking what is needed. Bring this information to urban AK to foster understanding and acceptance of rural needs.
- Find funding outside of public system. There is growing desire from businesses to partner with rural AK for needs.
- Hunter Ed fosters responsible hunters in field.
- Attempt to create a regulatory process that is more responsive to all hunters needs statewide. Including reassessing current regs for current day applicability.
- Increased use of media (TV, radio, etc.) to foster responsible hunter behavior and firearm safety – A well designed campaign.
- Also use media to improve public image of hunters.

Public education issues:

- Cross education, fostering respect between people who use and enjoy wildlife differently.
- In Dept's materials on conservation education. There is no literature (curriculum guide) where that hunting is discussed as legitimate use of wildlife.
- Will new outreach in education affect funding to game management?
- Department doesn't do good job of education in general.

Public education solutions:

- AK native heritage center is good example of ways to help educate public to cross cultural values.
- Completion of Potter Marsh Center. This is also example of good partnering with private and public sector.
- More partnering with public and private sector.
- Regional education coordinator in every region.
- People who don't hunt need to buy-in with their dollars like hunters do with their tax on firearms, etc. A tax on thing like cameras needs to be supported.
- Focus education on value of hunting and viewing economy of state.
- Establishing guidelines for wildlife viewing (Is "packaged" viewing appropriate?).

PUBLIC SERVICE

Issues: (identified by participants on yellow cards)

- Development of public supported predator management for timely actions.
- Remove politics from wildlife management. Is it possible?
- Integrate ecosystem planning in wildlife planning and conservation.
- Maintain good hunting and viewing opportunities near where people live (or make accessible)
- Less focus on hunting alone.
- Maintain wildlife diversity in urban areas and towns.
- There definitely needs to be more native involvement or participants. As it is now out of the 30+ people in this meeting there are only 5 or 6 native representatives.
- To fully involve the public in decision making (e.g. stakeholder groups).
- Whatever product comes out of this needs the approval of all participants or villages.
- Increased opportunities for constructive dialogue between diverse voices on all sides of management issues (facilitated meetings).
- More balanced game board.
- More outreach to the native communities.
- Input from locals.
- Better planning from input.
- Public education and dissemination of information.
- Public information resources. Excellence or nothing. No more boring information.
- Use people's interest in wildlife to promote conservation.
- Need to maintain individual's connection to nature.
- Solidifying the link between healthy ecosystems and a strong economy.

Facilitated session:

- What is "public service?"
- Distribution of information.
- Research.
- Where to go to see/hunt/etc.
- How to.
- Involving the public, organizations, individuals, groups.
- The DWC providing services to the public.
- It's what the public wants.
- It's more than hunting and fishing..
- Mutually informative (DWC/public) based on dialog.
- Public services crosses over all other programs.

Definition of public service:

- Public services involves dissemination of information and the exchange of ideas between the DWC and the public, resulting in solutions to areas of concern and conflict.

Possible solutions (and numbers of votes received):

- Web site (2).
- Public Information counters at Fish and Game offices (1).
- Need Public Information staff in rural areas (2).
- Expand subject matters for weekend (etc.) clinics (1).
- Partnership and/or support wildlife related projects sponsored by other groups or organizations (2).
- 800 number, especially for folks in rural areas (1).
- Act as clearing house for directing folks to the proper organization to get information.
- Community forums (3).
- To get ideas from the public.
- To present ideas to the public.
- Organize a speaker's bureau of staff and volunteers.
- Airport kiosks.
- Partner with Alaska Airlines – magazine.
- “How to” publications.
- Videos.
- Ecosystem view/approach.
- Public outreach is a public service.
- Involve school children.
- Media campaign (public service announcements for example).
- Team with other conservation groups.
- ID ways to improve ways to coordinated between .
DWC and law enforcement.
- Public service must be based on good information.
- DWC staff work with schools.

**Suggested Ways to Effectively Communicate with the Public
(with numbers of votes received)**

- Anonymous call-in program (0).
- Keep these kinds of meetings going and call us again (2).
- Get on agenda of regional non-profits annual meetings as guest speaker (10).
- Maintain direct communication with tribes & tribal resource management agencies (6).
- Internet chat rooms (1).
- Use PSAs to get word out a out these meetings (8).
- Newsletter to universities (0).
- Radio talk show topic discussions (15).
- Current topics on an 800 number (0).
- Weekly TV show (6).
- Involve several employees in next scoping meeting (0).
- Do a monthly habitat report based on satellite data (7).
- E-mail (0).

- Monthly planning newsletter (2).
- Public information officers (6).
- Weekly column in newspaper by ADFG on issues (14).
- Editorials to non-profit organizations (4).
- Booth at state fairs for issues (2).
- More meetings like this in other areas of state (13).
- Post proceedings on web with email for comments (11).
- Attend associations' conventions & meetings + talk about what's happening (15).
- Encourage use of current game management process (2).
- At advisory committees – more involvement by Board and ADFG members (0).
- Use of other organizations (1).
- List servers (2).
- Direct mail out of this type of information in time to provide written comments (2).
- DWC (Wayne) have a monthly call in show (like the governor's) (1).
- Get information out to local advisory committees (2).
- Work with Feds to combine money's to run expanded or new programs (0).
- When people are running for political office, some mis-information is given out. ADFG watchdog to make sure accurate information is given out, too (0).
- Publish this meeting summary & provide to board of game (0).
- Have full transcriptions of meetings so public can access what is being said to ADFG (0).
- "Wayne's World" TV show (9).

COMMENTS ON FUNDING FROM WAYNE REGELIN

I want to talk a few minutes about current funding within the Division and new funding sources. The DWC has an annual base budget of about \$16.5 million. About 60 % of these funds come from hunting license and tag fees and about 39 % from the federal tax on arms and ammunition that is distributed to states via a formula. Of the 16.5 million, only \$250,000 or 1.5 % of our budget comes from the general fund or tax dollars.

We also get funds for special projects through a variety of grants and contracts. We spend about 3 million each year on special projects, primarily research on marine mammals, but we also have smaller projects on goshawks and other species.

These funding sources may shift slightly each year, but it is not likely that they will change greatly in the near future.

The new source of funds I am counting on comes from the federal government via CARA legislation.

Let me take a minute and bring everyone up to speed on the status of CARA legislation. I know many of you are still working hard on CARA legislation and know all the details, but some may not.

Last summer the House of Representatives passed HB 701, called the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000. Congressman Young was the sponsor of this legislation, so Alaska was a key player. The bill, as passed by the House, provided \$350 million to state fish and game agencies to be allocated by a formula based on the size and population of each state. These funds are provided primarily for increased work in the areas of fish and wildlife education, management of non-game species, and wildlife related outdoor recreation. The best thing about the House bill was that it was a permanent appropriation. It would be available every year without action by the Congress.

The CARA bill that passed the House also had several other titles or sections that provided funds for coastal impact assistance, state and federal land and water conservation programs, historical site preservation and others. All of these programs would have provided funds for Alaska.

After passage in the House by over 300 votes, a majority of both Republicans and Democrats voted for the bill, it moved to the Senate.

Senator Murkowski was the prime sponsor for the bill in the Senate. Serious opposition to the bill developed over the federal land and water title because funds were provided to purchase additional federal lands. There was also opposition within the senate to a permanent appropriation. Members of the powerful appropriations committee always want to keep their authority to appropriate funds annually and strongly resist permanent appropriations.

We worked hard and had 66 cosponsors for the bill in the senate, including Senator Lott. But opponents of the bill kept it from a floor vote and we thought the bill was dead. However, it had such great support that it was resurrected through the appropriation bills as the Senate concluded its business last December. Senator Stevens was the key supporter for this last minute action.

When all was said and done, Congress had appropriated \$50 million for the State Fish and Wildlife Agencies to be allocated to states by the formula in the original bill. Alaska's share of the \$50 million was 2.4 million. But, Congress must appropriate the funds each year. The bottom line is we have 2.4 million in additional funds for this year and expect to continue to get at least that much in future years.

Congressman Young reintroduced HB 701 in February. It is very similar to last year's bill. It will provide \$350 million to state fish and game agencies each year on a permanent basis. We now have 223 cosponsors of the bill in the House and I expect the bill to pass the House before the August recess. We will then have 18 months to get it through the senate.

If we get the \$350 million for all states, Alaska's annual share will be just over 17 million a year.

We are also working on continuation of the \$50 million for FY02 because we expect it to take 18 months to get HB 701 through the senate. Last week the interior appropriations subcommittee passed a budget bill that not only continues to provide money in FY02 but also increases the amount from \$50 million to \$100 million.

That is the latest on CARA from the national level. Something we need to keep in mind is that CARA federal dollars must be matched by state or private funds on a 3 to 1 basis. So if we receive 17 million in CARA funds, we will \$5.5 million dollars of matching funds or we cannot spend the federal dollars.

As I said, we get only 250,000 in general fund. Several years ago we received up to 1.5 million per year in General funds, but it is not likely that we will get additional general funds, certainly not 5 million dollars.

It is legal to use hunting license fees to match CARA funds, but we do not have enough license revenue to match both the regular PR funds and the additional CARA funds. Also, it would cause a significant political problem to if the division used hunting license fees to match CARA funds for programs for non-game species and watchable wildlife programs. Most hunters understand the value of wildlife education and do not resist using license money for these programs, but they seem to draw the line at watchable wildlife.

So, we need new ideas for ways to generate funds for matching the federal dollars. I will be happy to answer questions.

SUGGESTED WAYS TO SPEND NEW MONEY (with numbers of votes received)

- Recreational facilities; trailheads, trail crossings, bridges (2).
- Do a plan for how to provide wildlife viewing opportunities and implementation (9).
- Long-term planning division (6).
- Implementation of predator control where necessary (7).
- Find out more about invasive species and prevention (2).
- Habitat protection (19).
- Public education (14).
- Research nongame (1).
- Facility upgrades and construction (3).
- Habitat rehabilitation/trails (11).
- Increase funding for local advisory committees (6).
- Local capacity building and training (8).
- Paying for public outreach ideas (0).
- Petition USDA to do river basin study for Kuskokwim River (1).
- Funding for Alaska Wildlife Safeguard program (poachers prevention) (4).
- Statewide overlay showing all species and effects of any one being removed (10).
- Use traditional ecological knowledge in co-management in all projects (10).
- Improve information gathering on wildlife and habitats (3).
- Ecological and game research (14).
- Fund grants in depressed areas for tourism (1).
- Update watchable Wildlife brochures by areas of the state (3).
- Develop roads – access to view (1).

Closing Comments from Wayne Regelin

Before you leave I would like to share some of my impressions of the day.

First, it was again clearly apparent to me how important wildlife is to many Alaskans. In today's session, all of you brought your own special interests and ideas with you and, from the discussions I heard, it's apparent that wildlife is important to all of you for a variety of reasons.

Wildlife has substantial economic implications for Alaskans and many people depend on wildlife for their livelihood. Hunt guides, wildlife viewing and photography guides, lodge owners, tour operators, and personal use and subsistence hunters were among the interests I heard identified during today's session.

Wildlife is a key to tourism in Alaska. Many people visit Alaska primarily for the opportunity to see and photograph wildlife in their natural settings.

Hunting is a way of life for many Alaskans and provides a vital and valued food resource for many people, including those living in rural parts of the state as well as in urban settings.

I think I heard from nearly everyone that wildlife improves their quality of life.

I heard a lot of good ideas today, and while I don't think I heard anything I hadn't heard or thought about before, I noted some new twists and emphasis. It wasn't particularly surprising to not hear a lot of brand new ideas since our staff make a concerted effort to talk with and listen to the public.

I heard from several people with a wide diversity of ideas and values. I think it's important that we remember that values are not right or wrong, they are just different.

I was very pleased with the positive and constructive way ideas and suggestions were shared and discussed. Even when people disagreed on particular issues, an element of respect was present throughout the day.

I was surprised with a few of the outcomes from the session. In particular, I hadn't expected to see planning develop as a separate issue category. We had originally considered including planning as a separate category (the planning staff certainly supported the idea), but after lots of discussion we decided that planning should be included as an integral part of all issue categories and decision-making processes.

I was not surprised that subsistence was identified as an important issue. Nor was I surprised that no solutions were agreed upon after an hour of discussion. Nonetheless, I know that it is an issue of overriding importance to Alaskans and it is probably good to discuss it at meetings like this. We did not include it in our list of key issues, not because it is not important, but because it is beyond our ability to resolve at this time. It will take actions by the legislature, congress, or the court system to resolve it.

I was surprised by the apparent lack of interest in the issue of public service. After talking with some of you and listening in on the small breakout group that discussed this subject, I realize that this is primarily an internal issue. It is very important to the division, but it doesn't appear to be an issue with the public, at least until the public doesn't receive good service from us.

I greatly appreciate the time you took to attend and participate in today's session. Your insights and advice will be useful to us as we continue our planning processes. This is not the end of our public involvement activities, but rather just the beginning. We will be following up with all of you as our planning process moves forward. Thanks.

Closing Comments from Doug Larsen

I would like to add my thanks to you all for participating in today's session. I was struck by several comments that I heard shared throughout the day. I heard that there's a desire and appreciation for an open and inclusive process for developing long-range efforts for managing and conserving Alaska's wildlife and wildlife uses. I heard that we need to be sure and involve the broad and diverse public in the planning process, including Tribal entities, Fish and Game Advisory Committees, other agencies, and the general public. I heard that we should include and incorporate local and traditional knowledge in our decision-making process. I heard that we should create and develop new and unobtrusive wildlife viewing opportunities. I heard that we should focus on cross-education, with links and appreciation for rural and urban perspectives on wildlife issues and uses. And I heard that we should work towards developing partnerships for collecting data and developing programs.

I would like to acknowledge that in any process there are often limitations that are unforeseen, however unintended. If any issues that you feel are important did not get captured here today, I encourage you to provide them to us by mail, e-mail, or a phone call. Also, before you leave, please make sure you signed the participant list and ensure that we have your address, e-mail, and phone number.

I have appreciated the broad mix of backgrounds, interests, and experience that has been assembled here today and I appreciate the great ideas that have been identified and discussed. Finally, I would like to thank you all for the sensitive and respectful way in which you interacted with one another as you discussed issues from differing perspectives and values. Thanks for coming and for being an important part of the future of Alaska's wildlife management and conservation.

Session Evaluation

Positives:

- Lunch.
- The small groups.
- The diversity of interests present.
- The open format.

- Expressing concerns.
- Brainstorming with dot vote follow-up.
- Meeting new people – the list was good.
- Continental breakfast.
- Good facility for the meeting.
- The location – not having to pay for expensive downtown parking.
- Session was well-organized and run.

Change next time:

- Need an afternoon break.
- Directly invite tribes.
- An overview at the beginning of what DWC does would have been nice – like a 15 minute PowerPoint presentation.
- Report to and invite the Advisory Committees.
- Have the meeting outdoors (it was a beautiful day!).

List of Participants

Austin Ahmasuk – Kawerak
 Ralph Andersen – Bristol Bay Native Association
 Alex Carter – Bird Treatment and Learning Center
 Steve Davila – Alaska Trappers Association
 Chip Dennerlein – National Parks & Conservation Association
 Dan Elliot – Denali State Park Citizen’s Advisory Committee
 Larry Evanoff – Chugiak Corporation
 Nancy Fair – U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Division of Federal Aid
 Dale Fox – Alaska Tourism Industry Association
 Jack Frost – Alaska Bowhunters Association
 Steve Ginnis – Tanana Chiefs Conference
 Tracy Gotthardt – Alaska Natural Heritage Program
 Eddie Grasser – Alaska Outdoor Council
 Kathleen Graves – Mainland Company
 Robert Hardy – Alaska Professional Hunters Association
 Tom Harris – Alaska Village Initiatives
 Jennifer Hooper – Association of Village Council Presidents
 Eleanor Huffines – Wilderness Society
 Julie Jessen – Alaska Conservation Foundation
 Eric Johnson – Association of Village Council Presidents
 Paul Joslin – Alaska Wildlife Alliance
 Jim King – Ducks Unlimited
 Larry Lau – Mentasta Traditional Council
 Sarah Leonard – Alaska Wilderness Recreation Tourism Association
 Tina Long – Alaska Village Initiatives
 George Matz – Anchorage Audubon Society

Larry Mercurief – RurAL Cap
Mark Miller – Alaska Tourism Industry Association
Stanley Ned – Tanana Chiefs Conference
Martin Nie – University of Minnesota, Duluth
Bob Och – Foundation for North American Wild Sheep
Phil Pringle – Alaska Bowhunters Association
Skye Rubadeau – Alaska Humanities Forum
Gabe Sam – RurAL Cap
Stan Senner – Audubon Alaska
Enoch Shiedt – Maniilaq Association
Gloria Stickwan – Copper River Native Association
Aneta Synan – Dept. of Community & Economic Development, Division of Tourism
Gene Terland – Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Thede Tobish – Municipality of Anchorage
Neil Webster – Alaska Professional Hunters Association
Mary Bethe Wright – Bird Treatment and Learning Center